DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 722 HE 003 874

AUTHOR Fuller, Bruce; And Others
TITLE California Student Vote 1972; A Brief Analysis of the Student Vote.
INSTITUTION California Univ. Student Lobby, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Jan 73
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Responsibility; *Colleges; *Political Issues; Student Attitudes; Student Opinion; *Student Participation; *Voting

ABSTRACT

This study of the impact of the student vote in California was based on a comprehensive analysis of 54,000 student votes. The precinct analysis method was utilized to examine the voting returns of precincts which contain very close to 100% student populations. Results of the study encompassed an overview of the student vote; voter turnout; presidential results; congressional, state senate, and assembly races; and state ballot propositions. Factors affecting how students vote included population, size, density and degree of isolation of the student community, selectivity of the colleges and academic characteristics of the student body; urbanization; geographic/regional location; and family income. Observations concerning the effects of the student vote in California indicated its importance. Tables summarizing the data are included. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078722

CALIFORNIA STUDENT VOTE 1972

A Brief Analysis of the Student Vote

January, 1973

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
[illegible] and Bruce Fuller
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Prepared for the University of California Student Lobby by:
Bruce Fuller
Mike Gilson
Linda Bond

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HEDU 3 B74

ED 078722

CALIFORNIA STUDENT VOTE 1972

A Brief Analysis of the Student Vote

January, 1973

Prepared for the University of California Student Lobby by:
Bruce Fuller
Mike Gilson
Linda Bond

We wish to thank county registrar offices throughout California and in several other states, housing officers of many campuses, and our colleagues in assisting with the large job of data collection. We also want to thank the Graduate Students' Association at UCLA for helping out with the publications costs. Finally, we express our appreciation to Mr. Kevin Bacon, Co-director of the Student Lobby for his assistance coordinating the technical production aspects of the project and for refining the text.

B.F.
M.G.
L.B.

Copyright © 1973 by the University of California
Student Lobby and Bruce Fuller
All Rights Reserved

FOREWORD

Since the mid 1960's many young Americans have expressed profound dissatisfaction and disillusionment with a society and political system which for many reasons often makes little sense to them. Young people across the country have become more issue conscious, politicized, polarized, and alienated. Entering the decade of the 70's, the young had become political activists, politically minded, and often political footballs. (Many remained simply apathetic.) Many young people expressed the attitude that the system was not addressing their perceptions of America's needs and priorities, while those in "the system" told the young to work within that system. Many people continue to believe that this was just a bad generation, and that the young should be thankful for what they have and remain silent. However, many also feel that the young were then and continue to be a positive force in the American political process. It was this desire to include the young more directly in the political process that led to a push for an eventual ratification in 1971 of the twenty-sixth amendment giving 18-year-olds the right to vote.

Campus activities and student social and political activities had, and continue to have, a significant impact upon the attitudes and directions of this country. In the past such impact was made outside of the political process per se. The twenty-sixth amendment, however, now provided the young, and students in particular, the opportunity to

make an even greater impact from within "the system" on election day. The question then became how and to what extent would the youth vote be felt, and how would students exercise their newly won opportunity?

In a very real way the University of California Student Lobby is in the business of injecting ideas into the political process which serve to benefit the needs and priorities of a constituency which includes many who are profoundly alienated and many more who are disturbingly apathetic to the present political process. So in early November 1972, we were holding our breath, perhaps more than anyone else, waiting to see how students and the young would utilize their new-found political tool-- the vote.

This study began as a survey of how students at the University of California campuses exercised their recently realized political muscle. This examination continued to grow as we became more interested in what the impact of the student vote was in California. Before going any further, we should note that the student vote is only a part of the 18-24 age group "youth vote". Our study is a look at the student vote and should not be interpreted as the results of how the 18-24 age group voted. A look at the California student vote in specific is particularly valuable for several reasons. First, over 40% of those in the 18-24 age group in California are students. Second, students, particularly those in California, compose a politically significant segment of the state's population in terms of numbers and political activism. Third, California offers a great number and diverse variety of college campuses and student populations which can be studied. Fourth, one need only ask several state legislators, who suffered rather close calls, to understand that the

student vote made a significant impact in California. Fifth, the state of California has had its share of campus unrest and student activism; it is particularly valuable to examine how students throughout the state chose to be heard in early November in gaining insight into nation-wide trends.

With these ideas in mind, we expanded our study to include a comprehensive analysis of the student vote at all University of California campuses, 12 of the 19 campuses of the California State University and Colleges system, and several colleges and universities of the private sector. We are also presently in the process of comparing the student vote in California to 10-15 colleges and universities nationwide. The national data will be available in supplementary form in the near future. We did not develop any data on the voting patterns of community college students or high school seniors. The largely "commuter" nature of their student bodies makes it impossible to identify how students vote. Students who attend the colleges are not concentrated in a few precincts but dispersed widely in the surrounding community. Nor does our study thouroughly examine the voting patterns of the entire 18-24 age group. We have, however, made some educated deductions as to how these groups voted. Hopefully, our study can serve as a starting point for further, more thorough work in these areas.

The narrative of the study is in two parts. The first presents and discusses the data from over thirty college and university campuses throughout California. In that discussion we have also attempted to look at the various factors which have an effect on how students vote. The tables serve as summaries of the data and as reference tools for the narrative. The second part of the narrative is a more subjective, applied examination of several key state legislative races where the

student vote had a significant impact. The student vote had substantial impact upon several races throughout the state, and the examination of these races is valuable in understanding new political variables present due to the student vote.

We should point out that the factors which influence how students vote and which candidates and issues students choose to support are complex questions and difficult to precisely identify and impossible to stereo-type. We do, however, believe that in the first general election in which students cast their votes, students have revealed that they plan to voice their attitudes rather loudly and with significant impact. Much remains to be learned about how students behave in the voting booth; however, if the student vote in California 1972 is any indication, it appears that students are going to continue to visit polling places in large numbers; they are determined to be heard. The student has now been integrated into "the system". The political system must now begin to listen to what the young are saying both on the campus and in the voting booth.

Bruce Fuller
Mike Gilson
Linda Bond

January, 1973

The Study Itself

Before we discuss what we found, we perhaps should explain how the study was designed. As in any research that involves collection of data, the method and form in which the data is collected and analyzed has significant effect upon the meaning and validity of the data and subsequent conclusions. Therefore, in discussing how the data was collected and analyzed we have noted what effects the research design has on the statistical findings.

We wanted to examine a large sample of students in California, and at the same time look at differences between campuses. These motivations, along with practical problems with regard to data collection technique, led us to utilize a precinct analysis method. By analyzing the voting returns of precincts which contain very close to 100 percent student populations we were able to obtain a very large total sample (54,000 students) and were able to examine the data in a variety of ways. In all, voting data was examined from all nine campuses of the University of California, 12 of the 19 campuses of the California State University and Colleges system, and seven private universities and colleges in California. Data is presently being collected from fifteen schools nation-wide.

There were a few variables that were introduced by looking at student precincts. Student populations in campus areas vary according to the enrollment and the housing situation at a particular campus. Thus, the number of voting precincts with 95-100 percent student populations also vary significantly from campus to campus.

For instance, UC Santa Barbara with a large student population in nearby Isla Vista has ten student precincts, whereas Cal State Los Angeles serves primarily commuting students and, therefore, no voting precincts can be isolated as being composed of 95-100 percent student populations. Thus, valid data from a few of the state universities and colleges was not available since no student precincts could be isolated. In some instances student populations are in one precinct; however, the total precinct population has non-students as well. These precincts were examined; however, the data is not incorporated into the data summaries.

It should also be noted that examining student voting patterns through a precinct analysis also affects what type of student sample you obtain. Concentrated student population on or near campus include dormitories, fraternities and sororities, and student apartments. Precinct analysis does not include information for the most part on how commuting students voted. Factors such as age, proximity to campus, and whether a student lives at home or in a student area may affect how a student votes and thus, have consequences on how valid our sample is. However, we believe that to a great extent these factors are often offsetting and most often not significant with respect to the large student sample which we have analyzed.

All precinct data was obtained from county registrars and analyzed with the help of housing information from the various campuses. Voting return information on a precinct by precinct basis is available for each of the campuses included in the analysis (see Table 1). (For such information contact the UC Student Lobby Office in Sacramento.)

Part I - The Student Vote: The Results

In compiling the summaries of the voting data (see Tables 2, 3, 4) only those campuses where at least one identifiable precinct with 95-100 percent student population were included. The summaries were developed from the campus precinct data and were compiled for the University of California, California State University and Colleges, and private sector in the three tables. To make comparisons possible between the UC and CSUC systems, the campuses included in the summaries were weighted according to enrollment, and estimates were then calculated as to how students in the two public segments voted state-wide.

Although the ballot included a large number of important state propositions, we thought propositions 2, 19, 20, and 22 would be particularly valuable in examining student attitudes and political feelings. Data from most campuses on propositions 14 and 15 was also examined. (See Table 14)

In order that differences between campuses could be closely studied, a campus political attitude (CPA) index was developed. The index is very useful in comparing the relative political attitudes of different campuses. Almost all campuses reflected consistantly liberal political attitudes. There are, however, significant differences between campuses as to how the students voted. The CPA Index clearly shows these differences.

The attachment of the terms "liberal" and "conservative" are most often more convenient than accurate; however, the terms remain useful in describing political attitudes, and thus, we will use them

in comparing the campuses and in utiliziang the CPA Index. The index was obtained by calculating the mean of the percentage vote for Senator McGovern, for proposition 19, for proposition 20, and against proposition 22. Therefore, if on a hypothetical campus McGovern received 100 percent of the vote, propositions 19 and 20 were supported by all, and proposition 22 was opposed by everyone who voted, then the campus would have a CPA Index of 100.0 and would be viewed as a highly liberal campus. The McGovern vote and the three ballot propositions were chosen because they were state-wide issues and could be viewed in most respects as liberal or conservative options. Certainly they were not entirely black and white, liberal vs. conservative choices; however, they are distinct and valuable in comparing relative liberal and conservative differences between campuses. Such differences revealed by data will be discussed later on, and are shown in the tables.

Voter Turnout

Turnout by students was slightly lower than the general population in terms of percentage voting of registered voters. However, it does appear that in terms of eligible voters (California citizens over 18 years of age), student turnout had greater percentages than the general population state-wide. Massive voter registration campaigns on campuses throughout the state were responsible for registration of around 80 percent of eligible student voters. Thus, while turnout in student precincts of registered voters was slightly lower than the general population, voter turnout in student precincts as a percentage of student of voting age was higher than the general population. In addition, a substantial number of students were registered at their parents' home address and not registered in

the precincts which we examined. Such absentee balloting further increased the voter turnout of eligible voters figure, but it was impossible to measure the exact amount of increase.

The sample precincts of University of California students examined reveal that an estimated 72.4 percent of registered students voted. This compares to an estimated voter turnout of 71.9 percent for students at the California State University and Colleges. The state-wide survey of 94 student precincts including the private universities and colleges shows a 73.8 percent campus average registered voter turnout. These figures compare to a 82.1 percent voter turnout of registered voters and 63.0 percent of eligible citizens of the general population state-wide. Voter turnout was highest at Sonoma State College (88.8%), UC Santa Cruz (84.0%), and UC San Diego (81.4%). Greatest voter apathy was displayed at San Francisco State with a turnout of 63.4 percent.

Presidential Results

The student precincts examined reveal widespread student preference for Senator George McGovern. Students in California consistently supported McGovern over Richard Nixon. However, the degree of support among students varied significantly.

University of California campuses on the average voted 77.7 percent for McGovern and 21.1 percent for Nixon. When campus figures are weighted in proportion to campus contribution to total UC enrollment, the estimated vote of UC students for McGovern is 75.4 percent to 23.3 percent for Nixon. This slight drop is caused by significantly smaller pluralities for McGovern at UCLA (70.2%) and UC Davis (66.6%). UC Santa Cruz gave McGovern the strongest support of any campus of the state with 94.5 percent of the vote with only 4.0 percent for Nixon.

UC students showed little preference for the American Independent Party candidate (0.5%) or the Peace and Freedom candidate (0.8%).

Students at California State University and Colleges also supported McGovern in great numbers; however, the degree of support was significantly less than that of UC students. Weighted figures show that an estimated 62.4 percent of CSUC students voted for the Democratic candidate for President while 35.4 percent cast their ballots for Nixon. Such figures reveal that CSUC student support dropped 13.0 percentage points from UC student balloting for McGovern. Nixon received the majority of the student vote at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (53.7%) and Cal Poly Pomona (54.0%). The percentage vote for McGovern at CSUC campuses ranged from 42.2 percent at Pomona to 83.6 percent at Sonoma State. CSUC students showed slightly greater preference in Spock and Schmitz, both receiving 1.0 percent of the vote.

An examination of private universities and colleges also reveals a strong preference for McGovern. Stanford University and Occidental College probably ranked at the top of pro-McGovern private schools with the Democrat getting 78.7 percent and 80.5 percent of the vote respectively. Of the sample, the University of Southern California was the least pro-McGovern with the Democrat receiving 58.8 percent of the vote to Nixon's 39.4 percent. Church affiliated colleges were apparently less supportive of McGovern based upon the student vote for McGovern at the Universities of San Francisco (67.3%) and Santa Clara (66.9%). For this reason it appears that of students attending private universities and colleges in California, 65-68 percent voted for George McGovern.

UC students showed little preference for the American Independent Party candidate (0.5%) or the Peace and Freedom candidate (0.8%).

Students at California State University and Colleges also supported McGovern in great numbers; however, the degree of support was significantly less than that of UC students. Weighted figures show that an estimated 62.4 percent of CSUC students voted for the Democratic candidate for President while 35.4 percent cast their ballots for Nixon. Such figures reveal that CSUC student support dropped 13.0 percentage points from UC student balloting for McGovern. Nixon received the majority of the student vote at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (53.7%) and Cal Poly Pomona (54.0%). The percentage vote for McGovern at CSUC campuses ranged from 42.2 percent at Pomona to 83.6 percent at Sonoma State. CSUC students showed slightly greater preference in Spock and Schmitz, both receiving 1.0 percent of the vote.

An examination of private universities and colleges also reveals a strong preference for McGovern. Stanford University and Occidental College probably ranked at the top of pro-McGovern private schools with the Democrat getting 78.7 percent and 80.5 percent of the vote respectively. Of the sample, the University of Southern California was the least pro-McGovern with the Democrat receiving 58.8 percent of the vote to Nixon's 39.4 percent. Church affiliated colleges were apparently less supportive of McGovern based upon the student vote for McGovern at the Universities of San Francisco (67.3%) and Santa Clara (66.9%). For this reason it appears that of students attending private universities and colleges in California, 65-68 percent voted for George McGovern.

In the 94 student precincts examined 69.0 percent voted for McGovern and 29.3 percent for Nixon. This figure should not, however, be interpreted to mean the total state-wide student vote for McGovern. The survey does not include samples from the smaller state colleges, and it only includes precincts from eleven private schools. Most importantly the survey does not include student vote data from community (two-year) colleges or from high schools. In California a total of 320,000 full-time day students attend community colleges and 95,000 are enrolled in private universities and colleges. Anticipating a further drop in support for McGovern among community college and high school students, we estimate that of the total student vote in California McGovern received 58 percent of the vote with Nixon polling 41 percent ± 2.0 percent.

Congressional, State Senate, and Assembly Races

Students state-wide, with few exceptions, favored Democratic candidates in legislative races. As with the general population across the country, there was a great deal of ticket splitting by student voters. In almost all cases Richard Nixon received a larger percentage of the vote than any other Republican on the ballot. There was also good indication that students did not consider party affiliation only when choosing local legislative candidates. Congressman Pete McCloskey and Senator Milton Marks of San Francisco, both considered liberal Republicans, received substantial support from students.

Precinct breakdowns of the university and college campuses examined (see Table 1) are available for all congressional, senatorial, and assembly races. (see Tables 8-13)

State Ballot Propositions

An examination of student voting patterns on several of the California ballot propositions is valuable in examining student opinions in general and on specific issues. We felt proposition 19, which sought to legalize marajuana, proposition 20, which enacted several significant measures for protecting the California coastline, and proposition 22, which would have greatly limited the labor unionization of the California farmworkers, all reflected political attitudes, and thus, they form the core of the CPA Index. The student vote on propositions 2, 14, and 15, relating to bonds for the University of California, tax reform, and state employees salary setting, respectively, were also examined. The data show "liberal" drop-offs on many of the ballot propositions as was seen in the presidential voting. Such differences can be seen in the summary tables.

Part II - Factors Affecting How Students Vote

There are significant differences between groups of campuses and individual campuses in regard to student voting patterns. Mechanisms such as the CPA Index are useful in identifying liberal-conservative attitudes with substantial precision. The next logical and most difficult question then becomes what are the causes and factors which effect differences in student voting patterns.

Throughout our study we have attempted to isolate numerous factors; however, it appears that there is no single factor or group of factors which can be isolated as statistically significant in affecting how relatively conservative or liberal an individual campus will vote. We have examined the following factors.

-- Population, size, and density and degree of isolation of the student community. The most significant factor appears to be the effects caused by a numerous and attitudinally dominant peer group. Those campuses which have large on- or near-campus student communities are in most cases the most liberal. Such trends are probably the result of more constant and consistent peer group pressures and liberal attitude reinforcement. The degree of isolation which the student community is situated with regard to the surrounding community is also a related factor. The effects of such factors can be seen in the differences between the UC and CSUC campuses as groups. Many more students live on- or near-campus who attend the University of California as compared to the

number who live near CSUC campuses. The larger and more dense student populations certainly are a factor in explaining the drop-off of 9.1 percentage points in the CPA Index from UC student to CSUC students. Those individual campuses which have a dense and somewhat isolated student community or student ghetto area also tend to vote more liberal, as can be seen in the percent variance from the CPA Index mean at UCSC (+ 15.3%), UCSB (+ 8.7%), UCSD (+ 5.0%), and Sonoma State College (+ 17.7%). Standford University also reflects such factors with a high CPA Index of 85.8 percent. This set of factors, however important, cannot be isolated as a dominant factor. This factor, like the others, does act in concert with other causes and factors.

--Selectivity of the college and academic characteristics of the student body. Colleges and universities can be ranked according to selectivity and academic characteristics of the student attending an individual campus by examining different measuring devices. Utilizing the mean SAT scores of the entering freshman class as such a device, a positive correlation does exist between overall academic ability of the school and to what degree the campus reflects politically liberal attitudes. As said before, however, this factor by itself is not statistically significant. It is valid, nevertheless, to pinpoint this selectivity-academic ability factor in explaining the differences in UC and CSUC campuses as groups and differences between individual campuses. For example, UC Santa Cruz, which is highly selective and serves students with very high grade point averages from high school, has a CPA Index of 96.5 percent. Campuses with very high admissions requirements

(SAT scores and high school grade point averages) tend to select students from a very narrow portion of the states high school graduating seniors. This group tends to be from families with income and educational backgrounds significantly higher than those of the state as a whole. Thus, by definition, highly selective schools have student populations significantly different than those of less selective (more open) institutions. That these students vote in a manner different than other students or the state as a whole is to be expected.

--Urbanization factor. It is valid to say that schools located in large metropolitan areas or close to urban areas tend to vote more liberal than those distant from urban regions. There is a positive correlation; however, this factor is relatively weak and more often than not is off-set by a stronger factor.

--Geographic/regional location of the campus. University and college students in California tend to reflect differences in political attitudes between different geographic and regional areas of the state. Such differences closely parallel attitudinal differences reflected by the general population in different areas. Students at campuses in northern California tend to be a bit more politically liberal than those in southern California. This factor is most clearly seen in the California State University and Colleges. This factor is most often off-set by more dominate factors at UC campuses and private schools.

--Family income. Family income is very positively correlated between liberal political attitudes of the parents and academic success of the children. For both these reasons family income

appears to be a very significant factor in the relative liberal attitudes of different campuses.

In general, the political attitudes of students, as reflected by the way in which they vote, are directly related to their parents situation in terms of financial resources. However, most likely the dominant factors upon student voting patterns involve environmental/peer group pressures within the student community. The intensity and attitudinal complexion of such environmental situations most directly affects how students will vote. In examining any of these factors, however, it must be remembered that none of them can be isolated as the cause or the dominant factor. Instead, these factors tend to act concurrently and with varying impact from campus to campus.

Part III - The Effects of the Student Vote in California

An examination of a few key California races points to the tremendous potential of the student vote. Little data is available to compare the results of the November election with preceeding contests in which the youth vote was a factor; therefore, the following observations remain just that-- observations.

In addition to the Presidential race, there were 80 assembly seats and numerous congressional and state senate seats involved in the 1972 general election. Many representatives were elected with the help of the student vote; a small portion were treated rather harshly by the student vote; a few politicians were defeated by the student vote.

The student vote is not an easy vote to understand. An analysis of this voice remains difficult, especially if one returns to traditional guideposts or relies on conventional methods of campaigning. It would be difficult, for example, for anyone who spends the major portion of his time in Sacramento, and who relies on the daily newspapers for his information about students, to successfully motivate those voters to support a particular candidate or proposition. We will attempt to demonstrate the importance of a vigorous campaign, which is taken directly to students, organized primarily by students, and which does not take for granted the fact that students will automatically vote in a particular manner.

At Stanford University, the same students who voted for McGovern 78.7 percent to 20.6 percent for Nixon voted for the Republican, Paul McCloskey, 69 percent to 31 percent over his liberal Democratic

challenger. Students at the University of California at San Francisco cast 60 percent of their ballots for George McGovern and only 40 percent of their votes for Richard Nixon, but backed Republican State Senator Milton Marks 61 percent to 39 percent over his Democratic opponent. The University of San Francisco students supported Marks 57.56 percent to 42.43 percent, while also backing McGovern 67.32 percent to 30.50 percent. San Francisco State University gave Marks 55.5 percent of their votes to 44.4 percent for his opponent, meanwhile, voting 69.2 percent to McGovern to 27.6 percent for Nixon.

In both the Marks and McCloskey campaigns students favored McGovern but were at least minimally satisfied with the Republican candidate, and did not vote for the Democrat simply because he was a Democrat. Clearly, the students felt that the Republican incumbent had done a fairly good job representing their interests.

Students attending University of California campuses at Santa Cruz, Davis and Santa Barbara, on the other hand, voted quite heavily against their incumbent legislators. At Santa Cruz Republican State Senator Donald Grunsky received only 8.6 percent of the vote to his challenger, Suzanne Paizis' 91.4 percent. At Santa Barbara, Assembly Democratic challenger Gary Hart garnered 96.2 percent of the student ballots to Assembly incumbent W. Don MacGillivray's 3.8 percent. At Davis there was a similar story-- Democratic insurgent George Shaw received 80.6 percent of the vote to incumbent Ray Johnson's 19.2 percent. Both Hart and Shaw came within 750 votes of defeating their Republican opponents.

At Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, and Davis the campaign of the Democratic challenger was very powerful-- visibly much stronger than even the McGovern campaign on those same campuses. The campaigns combined a vigorous campaigner who spent a great deal of time on the campus with students who could easily be characterized as the "opinion leaders" of that campus, resulting in continual press coverage by the campus newspaper (which is much more widely read by students than an outside newspaper). In all three campaigns there was a clear difference between the challenger and the incumbent. The vote was not the result of students flocking like sheep, as one leading professional campaigner has recently suggested, but rather the combination of a vigorous campaigner joining with key students to challenge an incumbent whose views they felt were contrary to their own. It is acknowledged that the high density of the living areas lended itself quite nicely to campaigning; almost all campuses, however, contained in the enclosed data have some high density areas-- and the results were not nearly the same.

In three very close assembly races the student vote was quite possibly the difference. In San Diego, first-term Assemblyman Kapiloff garnered 77.4 percent of the student vote in his upset victory. In Eureka, Barry Keene received 78.75 percent of the student vote, in what was otherwise a very close race. At UC Riverside freshman Assemblyman Ingalls received 85 percent of the student vote, in what was thought to be a close race. The slightly smaller percentage of the vote for Keene and Kapiloff, versus that of Shaw and Hart, may be a reflection of the difficulty of campaigning to California State University students who generally live in slightly less densely populated areas-- often in the center of a city. The student

communities of both Davis and Isla Vista are virtual islands unto themselves. In addition, the Hart and Shaw campaigns involved a large number of students who have become identified with elections in the student community.

Other factors were significant in the Hart and Shaw campaigns. Both campaigns were run by people around 25 years of age who easily identified with the student community. Both campaigns conducted vigorous voter registration campaigns designed to encourage students to register. Often a campaign cannot afford to rely on other sources to register people who would likely be voters for their candidate.

Probably the most important factor in the Hart and Shaw campaigns, and the Keene, Kapiloff and Paizis campaigns as well, was that not one of the candidates took anything about the student vote for granted. They did not assume that somebody else would register the voters, they did not presume that students would favor them--just because they were the Democrat. They did not assume that students would involve themselves in their campaigns without having some voice in that campaign. Most importantly, none of these candidates presumed for one moment that they would corner the student vote without working very, very hard for it.

TABLES

The following list and tables should serve to summarize the vast amount of data involved in the study coming from 39 universities and colleges in California. The list of campuses includes those California Colleges examined in this study and the fifteen schools nationwide currently being studied. Raw data from student vote returns is broken down by precinct from each campus and becomes particularly valuable in examining local legislative races and differences in voting patterns between campuses. This precinct information is currently available from the UC Student Lobby.

Voting return and registration summaries by campus, grouped for University of California campuses, California State University and Colleges, and private universities and colleges have also been developed. These summary tables are useful in comparing campus differences and in comparing variations overall between the three groups. Simple mean averages for all three groups for voter turnout, presidential balloting, ballot propositions, and the CPA Index are shown in the tables. For the UC and CSUC groups, individual campus data has been weighted to reflect differences in campus enrollments and an estimated state-wide mean for each group has been calculated. These weighted means indicate how students state-wide registered and voted in the University of California and California State University and Colleges. The Campus Political Attitudes Index (CPA) and the variance calculated for each campus are useful in comparing comprehensive differences in political preferences and attitudes between schools, and between UC and CSUC as groups.

Table 1

Colleges and Universities Included in Student Vote Analysis[1]

California

University of California Campuses
- Santa Barbara
- Berkeley
- Davis
- Santa Cruz
- Los Angeles
- Riverside
- Irvine
- San Diego
- San Francisco (-60%)

Calif. State University and Colleges
- Humbolt
- San Luis Obispo
- Chico
- Sonoma
- Sacramento
- San Diego
- San Jose
- Fullerton
- Northridge
- San Francisco
- Pomona
- Long Beach
- Hayward (40%)
- San Bernardino (-50%)
- Fresno (70%)
- Bakersfield (30%)

Private Universities and Colleges
- University of Southern California
- University of San Francisco
- California Institute of Technology
- Occidental College
- University of Santa Clara
- Claremont Colleges
- Stanford University

Nationwide[2]

- Oklahoma State University
- Michigan State University
- Western Illinois University
- University of Connecticut
- Concordia College (Minnesota)
- Lewis and Clark College (Oregon)
- University of Oregon
- University of Alabama
- University of Colorado
- University of Florida
- Harvard University
- University of Southern Mississippi
- Columbia University
- SUNY Buffalo
- University of Rochester (New York)

1. The student vote data analyzed was composed of returns for precincts with 95-100% student populations with the exception of those schools which are followed by a parenthesized percentage. This figure indicates the estimated percentage made-up of students in relation to the entire population of the precinct data for that individual campus.

2. Student vote precinct data is presently available for the first seven schools. Data collection for the latter eight schools has not been completed. Information on these campuses will, hopefully, be available in the near future.

Table 2

Student Vote Summary -- University of California

	# pre.	turnout	Presidential nix	mcg	smz	spk	Propositions 2	14	15	19	20	22	CPA Index	Variance I-M	Variance %Var
UCSB	15	73.7%	13.9	85.2	0.2	0.7	93.5 6.5			92.1 7.9	96.0 4.0	9.4 90.6	91.0	+7.3	+8.7%
UCLA	8	67.1	28.8	70.2	0.4	0.5	91.8 7.2			81.6 18.4	88.5 11.5	16.1 83.9	81.0	-2.7	-3.2%
UCR	2	73.9	25.9	71.7	0.8	1.6	92.9 7.1	22.6 77.4	57.4 42.6	78.0 22.0	90.8 9.2	18.2 81.8	80.6	-3.1	-3.7%
UCSC	3	84.0	4.0	94.5	0.2	1.3	87.1 12.9			96.2 3.8	98.7 1.3	3.4 96.6	96.5	+12.8	+15.3%
UCD	5	80.2	33.4	66.6			96.9 3.1			76.5 23.5	91.7 8.3	22.6 77.4	78.1	-5.6	-6.7%
UCB	5	69.2	21.1	77.4	0.6	0.9	93.3 6.7	18.5 81.5	43.5 56.5	81.9 18.1	91.2 8.8	14.9 85.1	83.9	+0.2	+0.2%
UCI	2	73.8	22.1	76.5	0.8	0.6	89.7 10.3	23.6 76.4	46.0 54.0	82.2 17.8	91.6 8.4	16.1 83.9	83.6	-0.1	-0.1%
UCSD	4	81.4	19.4	79.5	0.6	0.5	94.2 5.8	27.8 72.2	62.8 37.2	86.3 13.7	93.4 6.6	7.7 92.3	87.9	+4.2	+5.0%
Total UC	44 (25,237)	75.4	21.1	77.7	0.5	0.8	92.5 7.5	23.1 76.9	52.4 47.6	84.4 15.6	92.7 7.3	13.6 86.4	85.3		
Total UC Weighted		72.4	23.3	75.4	0.5	0.8	92.9 7.1			82.9 17.1	91.5 8.5	5.1 84.9	83.7		

Table 3

Student Vote Summary -- California State University and Colleges

	# pre.	turnout	Presidential nix	mcg	smz	spk	Propositions 2	14	15	19	20	22	CPA Index	Variance I-M	%Var
Humbolt	2	74.5%	27.2	70.9	1.1	0.7	82.6 17.4	16.5 83.6	61.2 38.8	76.1 23.9	83.1 16.9	18.2 81.8	78.0	+5.0	+6.8
Chico	4	80.6	38.2	59.4	1.2	1.1	84.6 15.4	26.5 73.5	53.6 46.4	70.7 29.3	81.1 18.9	29.6 70.4	70.4	-2.6	-3.6
Sonoma	2	88.8	16.1	83.6	0.3	--	86.8 13.2	14.3 85.7	58.5 41.5	85.5 14.5	88.8 11.2	14.4 85.6	85.9	+12.9	+17.7
Sacramento	2	74.8	26.4	71.8	1.6	0.2	90.0 10.0	25.4 74.6	48.2 51.8	71.6 28.4	88.5 11.5	22.3 77.7	77.4	+4.4	+6.0
San Diego	3	79.6	38.9	59.7	1.0	0.3	79.3 20.7	31.7 68.3	57.5 42.5	79.1 20.9	86.7 13.3	19.1 80.9	76.6	+3.6	+4.9
San Jose	5	68.4	24.2	74.3	0.5	1.0	83.3 16.7	27.6 72.4	50.0 50.0	78.8 21.2	86.2 13.8	19.0 81.0	80.1	+7.1	+9.7
Fullerton	1	64.6	36.2	62.8	--	1.0	85.3 14.7	33.0 67.0	48.5 51.5	74.0 26.0	86.6 13.4	22.7 77.3	75.2	+2.2	+3.0
Northridge	2	65.6	26.8	70.3	1.5	1.4	81.7 18.3	21.9 78.1	55.7 44.3	71.3 28.7	81.7 18.3	22.1 77.9	75.3	+2.3	+3.2
San Fran	1	63.4	28.0	69.2	2.0	0.7	87.0 13.0	16.4 83.6	52.2 47.8	78.0 22.0	86.0 14.0	21.0 79.0	78.0	+5.0	+6.8
Pomona	1	78.1	54.0	42.2	1.1	2.7	80.6 19.4	32.2 67.8	61.0 39.0	63.8 36.2	82.4 17.6	33.1 66.9	63.8	-9.2	-12.6
San Luis	2	78.1	53.7	45.1	0.8	0.3	78.8 21.2	33.2 66.8	51.2 48.8	58.7 41.3	67.6 32.4	46.4 53.6	56.2	-16.8	-23.0
Long Beach	1	64.7	48.1	48.8	1.0	2.1	77.8 22.2	20.1 79.9	52.4 47.6	62.2 37.8	76.6 23.4	29.7 70.3	64.6	-8.4	-11.5
Total CSUC	26	73.4	34.8	63.2	1.0	.9	83.2 16.8	24.9 75.1	54.2 45.8	72.5 27.5	82.9 17.1	24.8 75.2	73.4		
Total CSUC Weighted		71.9	35.4	62.4	1.0	1.1	82.5 17.5	25.7 74.3	53.4 46.6	72.0 28.0	82.6 17.4	25.0 75.0	73.0		

Table 4

Student Vote Summary -- Private Institutions

	# pre.	turnout	Presidential nix	mcg	smz	spk	Propositions 2	14	15	19	20	22	CPA Index	Variance I-M	%Var
USC	1	72.5%	39.4	58.8	1.1	0.6	82.5 17.5			70.9 29.1	84.8 15.2	23.6 76.4	72.7		
USF	3	68.8	30.5	67.3	1.2	1.0	80.9 19.1	18.7 81.3	36.9 63.1	71.6 28.4	82.0 18.0	19.1 80.9	75.4		
Cal Tech	1	71.8	37.1	61.3	0.9	0.6	89.9 10.1			74.6 25.4	84.1 15.9	21.9 78.1	74.5		
Occidental	1	75.8	18.8	80.5	0.2	0.5	91.9 8.1			87.0 13.0	91.6 8.4	10.7 89.3	87.1		
Santa Clara	4	77.4	31.1	66.9	1.3	0.7	70.7 29.3	30.5 69.5	40.1 59.9	56.0 44.0	68.0 32.0	26.9 73.1	66.0		
Claremont Colleges	3	66.1	28.5	70.2	0.8	0.5	86.3 13.7			75.4 24.6	79.9 20.1	15.9 84.1	77.4		
Stanford	11	76.4	20.6	78.7	0.2	0.5	88.0 12.0	14.0 86.0	53.4 46.6	83.7 16.3	93.2 6.8	12.5 87.5	85.8		

24 precincts
(13,225)

Table 5

Voter Registration Summary
Five Campuses of University of California

Campus	Democrat	Republican	Peace & Freedom	AI	DS
UC San Francisco	65.1	25.1	0.9	--	8.8
UC Berkeley	70.5	15.5	1.3	--	12.2
UC Irvine	65.3	18.1	1.2	--	13.8
UC San Diego	64.7	17.6	1.9	0.1	14.3
UC Los Angeles	64.8	20.2	1.7	0.1	12.4
Mean Average	66.1	19.3	1.4	0.0	12.3
Weighted Mean-- State-wide Estimate	67.0	18.1	1.5	0.0	12.5

Democrat/Republican = 3.7/1

Table 6

Voter Registration Summary
Eight Campuses of California State University & Colleges

Campus	Democrat	Republican	Peace & Freedom	Amer In	DS
Sacramento	65.8	23,0	1.0	0.3	7.0
San Diego	57.7	30.3	0.9	0.0	10.5
San Jose	65.6	18.2	3.2	--	11.8
Fullerton	61.2	22.2	--	1.3	14.6
Northridge	62.0	22.0	2.0	0.8	9.2
San Francisco	70.9	17.3	1.2	0.2	10.4
Pomona	50.0	37.6	--	0.8	8.3
Long Beach	55.1	30.7	1.8	--	11.8
Mean Average	61.0	25.2	1.3	0.4	10.4
Weighted Mean-- State-wide estimate	61.1	24.8	1.4	0.3	10.5

Democrat/Republican = 2.5/1

Table 7

Voter Registration Summary
Seven Private Universities and Colleges

Campus	Democrat	Republican	Peace & Freedom	Amer In	DS
University of Southern Calif.	55.3	25.9	--	--	18.5
Stanford	61.9	26.9	0.5	--	11.2
University of San Francisco	69.6	17.5	0.9	0.1	11.7
Calif. Institute of Technology	54.3	26.7	1.1	--	17.9
Claremont Colleges	64.1	22.9	0.8	--	10.8
Occidental College	65.5	17.5	1.1	0.2	14.7
University of Santa Clara	70.8	17.6	0.7	0.4	9.4
Average	63.1	22.1	0.7	0.1	13.5

Table 8

STATE ASSEMBLY - UC CAMPUSES

Campus	Republican	Democrat	Votes Cast
UCSB	MacGillivray	Hart	
	3.8%	96.2%	6804
UCLA	Priolo	Diamond	
	27.5%	72.5%	2398
UCR	Hunter	Ingalls	
	15.0%	85.0%	426
UCSC	Murphy	Faitz	
	5.0%	95.0%	1707
UCD	Johnson	Shaw	
	19.4%	80.6%	2817
UCB	Balen	Meade	
	13.0%	87.0%	1351
UCI	Badham	Thorpe	
	17.4%	82.6%	657
UCSD	Stull	Garvin	
	16.5%	83.5%	898

Note: Data from UCSF is not included as the results were only found in mixed (student-nonstudent) precincts, hence, the data is unreliable.

Table 9

STATE SENATE - UC CAMPUSES

Campus	Republican	Democrat	Votes Cast
UCSB	No Contest		
UCLA	Stevens	O'Neill	
	16.8%	81.6%	2480
UCR	No Contest		
UCSC	Grunsky	Paizais	
	8.6%	91.4%	1718
UCD	No Contest		
UCB	Miles	Petris	
	11.8%	88.2%	1345
UCI	No Contest		
UCSD	Schrade	Gillis	
	13.9%	86.1%	928

Note: Data from UCSF is not included as the results were only found in mixed (student-nonstudent) precincts, hence, the data is unreliable.

Table 10

CSUC - ASSEMBLY

Campus	Republican	Democrat	Votes Cast
Humbolt	Antolini	Keene	
	21.2%	78.8%	1299
San Luis Obisbo	Nimmo	Williams	
	58.0%	42.0%	963
Chico	Johnson	Shaw	
	29.5%	70.5%	1524
Sonoma	Bagley	Moore	
	44.0%	56.0%	157
Sacramento	MacLean	Greene	
	19.1%	80.9%	570
San Diego	Barnes	Kapiloff	
	22.6%	77.4%	1101
San Jose	Browne	McAlister	
	18.6%	81.4%	1369
Fullerton	Briggs	Shipkey	
	31.8%	68.2%	85
Northridge	Cline	Gallagher	
	30.4	69.6%	671

Table 11

CSUC - STATE SENATE

Campus	Republican	Democrat	Votes Cast
Humboldt	Rogers	Collier	
	22.6	77.4	652
San Luis Obisbo	Grunsky	Paizis	
	59.4%	40.6%	1216
Chico	No Contest		
Sonoma	Rogers	Collier	
	27.8%	72.2%	119
Sacramento	McKinley	Rodda	
	19.7%	80.3%	802
San Diego	No Contest		
San Jose	Hart	Alquist	
	14.5%	85.5%	1739
Fullerton	Whetmore	Lacayo	
	32.2	62.1% (AI-5.7%)	82
Northridge	Cusanovich	Burke	
	27.0%	73.0%	677
San Francisco	Marks	Pelosi	
	55.6%	44.4%	637

Table 12

PRIVATE SCHOOLS - ASSEMBLY

Campus	Republican	Democrat	Total Votes
USC	--	B. Greene	
		100.0%	483
USF	Seeba	Foran	
	11.4%	88.6%	763
Cal Tech	Lanterman	Ridenour	
	38.3%	61.7%	253
Occidental	Collier	Regnier	
	20.3%	79.7%	359
Univ. of Santa Clara	Fargher	Vasconcellos	
	23.9%	76.1%	1547
Claremont	Lancaster	Axelrod	
	28.7%	71.3%	1051
Stanford	Hayden	Friar	
	23.6%	76.4%	4297

Table 13

PRIVATE SCHOOLS - STATE SENATE

Campus	Republican	Democrat	Total Votes
USC	Taggert	Dymally	
	27.0%	73.0%	530
USF	Marks	Pelosi	
	57.6%	42.4%	879
Cal Tech	Richardson	Hart	
	31.1%	68.9%	283
Occidental	Harmer	Rifken	
	21.5%	78.5%	340
Univ. Santa Clara	Hart	Alquist	
	14.5%	85.5%	1499
Claremont College	Whetmore	Lacayo	
	30.6%	69.4%	1044
Stanford	No Contest		

Table 14

BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

Proposition 2- This proposition asked for state authority to sell $156 million in bonds to finance the construction of health sciences teaching facilities at the University of California.

Proposition 14- This was the so-called "Watson Innitiative." It sought to set a constitutional limit on property taxes and increase sales and other taxes to make up for lost revenues.

Proposition 15- This proposition would have taken away the Governor's power to veto pay increases for state employees and given state employees a measure of collective bargaining privileges.

Proposition 19- This measure would have de-criminalized marijuana possession.

Proposition 20- This measure sought to enact a series of actions designed to limit coastline development in California.

Proposition 22- This measure would have established a labor relations act for farm workers in California. It was opposed by several farm workers unions including that of Caesar Chavez.